

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATING AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
STRATEGIC PLANNING ADVANCE
APRIL 14, 2005**

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE
MEMBERS**

- *Councilmember Doug Lingner, City of Phoenix, Chairman
- *Councilmember Rob Antoniak, City of Goodyear
- *Councilmember Roy Delgado, City of Goodyear
- Charlene Moran Flaherty, DES/CSA
- *Councilmember Joe Johnson, City of Surprise
- Councilmember Kyle Jones, City of Mesa
- Councilmember Marie Lopez-Rogers, City of Avondale
- *Councilmember Manuel Martinez, City of Glendale
- *Jim McCabe, Area Agency on Aging
- Carol McCormack, Mesa United Way
- *Vice Mayor Larry Morrison, Town of Gilbert
- *Councilmember Kathleen Nicola, Town of Fountain Hills
- Councilmember Kevin Osterman, City of Scottsdale
- *Janet Regner, Representative for Tempe Community Council
- Vice Mayor Phillip Westbrook, City of Chandler
- *Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox, Maricopa County, Vice-Chair

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- *Lorenzo Aguirre, El Mirage
- *Nichole Ayoola, City of Mesa
- Judy Bowden, Mesa United Way
- Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix
- *Paige Garrett, Glendale Human Services
- *Kate Hanley, Tempe Community Council

- Carl Harris-Morgan, Town of Gilbert
- Connie James, City of Scottsdale
- *Mary Lynn Kasunic, Area Agency on Aging
- Barbara Knox, DES/RSA
- Margarita Leyvas, Maricopa County HSD
- *John Paul Lopez, City of Tolleson
- Joyce Lopez-Powell, VSUW
- Dan Lundberg, City of Surprise
- Doris Marshall, City of Phoenix
- *Kyle Moore, DES/ACYF
- *Susan Neidlinger, DES/DDD
- Sandra Reagan, Southwest Community Network
- *Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale
- *Linda Snidecor, City of Goodyear
- Judy Tapscott, City of Tempe
- *Wayne Tormala, City of Phoenix, Vice Chair
- *Margaret Trujillo, Value Options
- Patrick Tyrrell, City of Chandler, Chairman
- Neal Young, City of Phoenix

OTHERS PRESENT

- Maureen DeCindis, MAG
- DeDe Gaisthea, MAG
- Teresa Franquiz, MAG
- Judy Garfinkle, Arizona State University
- Dr. John Hall, Arizona State University
- Lindsey Higginson, MAG
- (AmeriCorps)
- Brandee Meade, MAG
- Amy St. Peter, MAG
- Dr. Alex Zautra, Arizona State University

- *Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
- +Those members present by audio/videoconferencing.

1. Welcome Address

Amy St. Peter, MAG Human Services Manager, called the meeting to order at 11:48a.m. in lieu of Councilmember Doug Lingner, Chair of the Human Services Coordinating Committee. Ms. St. Peter made opening remarks, explained the purpose of the advance and introduced the agenda items. She noted that the lunch was provided by the United Methodist Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center, a shelter for homeless families. They have begun a new micro-enterprise project that includes training homeless individuals in the catering trade.

2. Resilience Solutions

Ms. St. Peter introduced John Hall, Professor of Public Affairs and Alex Zautra, Foundation Professor of Psychology at Arizona State University. Mr. Hall began by stating that every eight seconds, someone turns fifty. This information made the pair consider intervention strategies for communities unprepared for the sudden boom in the over-fifty population.

Mr. Zautra, who thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak to them on the topic of resilience. He stated that the concept was bringing about a new paradigm in psychology. He pointed out that there is not enough time in the day to prevent anything bad that could happen; even so, he countered, the resilience of a person determines the degree to which calamity has an effect. He asked that the committee think about defining human services in terms of resilience; to entertain a way of thinking about resilience in applying what is human to human services.

Mr. Hall and Mr. Zautra presented a PowerPoint further explaining the concept of the resilience model. Resilience, from the psychological perspective, was defined as the natural capacity to be nourished, to bounce back emotionally from stressors and to sustain positive energy even in the face of difficulties. The presentation gave examples of what happens when one adopts the principles of human resilience. One such example was a person affected by ALS, a disease in which all the muscles in the body eventually atrophy; this person chose not to suffer from the disease and was quoted as “looking forward to seeing another day.”

They stated that the resilience model of care looks at the person as a whole. For instance, when treating a person for a psychological concern, risk factors in physical health must also be addressed. Every person has something wrong with them, yet the general idea of the resilience model is not to fix everything wrong, but to strive for the highest quality of life possible for each person. They commented that no matter how much a person suffers, they still deserve a maximum quality of life. This requires a multi-dimensional approach, assessing the person’s resilience level in comparison with their individual risk level.

They continued by stating what conditions need to exist for the resilience model to take root in a community, as supported by empirical research. First, they showed how

an individual's health affects the community. A healthy individual is more likely to be socially connected, lead a life of purpose, and have a sense of self-efficacy and optimism. Much in the same way, healthy communities have greater degrees of neighbors interacting, of individuals working for the common good, have a sense of collective efficiency and a focus on asset based planning. These communities have economic and cultural diversity and opportunities for civic engagement.

The presenters gave an example of applying resilience to public policy. They named five assets of Arizona that, as yet, had not been exploited to their full potential: proximity to Mexico, the Churn, a desirable climate for invention, a permeable power structure and the leadership of the state. They called these "the five wells waiting to be tapped" in contrast to *The Five Shoes Waiting To Be Dropped*, a report prepared by the Morrison Institute For Public Policy. They said the idea of the resilience model paradigm change is to view the positive instead of the negative.

They listed principles one would abide by in building a resilient community. Noting that although communities are usually considered a place, there are many different applications of the word—one can be a part of a community of web surfers, for example. They stated that the chief principle of a community is that being a part of it benefits everyone in the community; a community must have something to offer its members, otherwise it will shrivel and die. Members also need hope, stating that the Valley of the Sun should actually be referred to as the Valley of Hope. The population is increasing at an outstanding rate and, while some will look at this as a negative thing, one could also view it with hope: many of the people who to Phoenix are improving their situation by doing so, such as people coming from Mexico and California and finding higher paying jobs or more affordable housing. They believed policy makers should pay attention to the hope of their constituents.

Other facets of resilient communities listed: nurturing and trust (people do, to some degree, have to trust one another), joy and the ability to celebrate (especially in their accomplishments), a healthy community and quality of life. Citing that while many people have overcome unbelievable adversity, when asked about their hardships, they will say it made them stronger, better and happier people. Quality of life is something every community must address.

In the process to building a resilient community, they held the following to be fundamental: strength, resources (and not just money), realism, time, balance and boundaries. They said that in sustaining a community's resilience, leadership, redundancy, connectability and adaptability are necessary.

The presenters showed the committee that resilience is becoming a hot topic worldwide, and stated that, while it was not yet receiving copious amounts of attention in the United States, there was quite a bit of interest in the resilience model in other countries, specifically Australia and England.

The committee asked what the difference was between resilience and survival. Mr. Hall responded that while survival suggests simply existing beyond stress, resilience implies more than survival; it means that one is bettered because of the adversity or challenge faced. Mr. Zautra added that it is important to understand that these things are not in a hierarchical order. People who don't survive can also be resilient. Their legacy can live on, even when they have passed away.

Another committee member cited a study in California on adults who were sexually abused as children who overcame this experience and went on to lead normal, healthy lives. They continued by saying they believed social scientists need to think about people who succeed and do well in life and asked if either of the professors had seen this study. The professors replied that they had seen a similar study by Masten and that, while people who suffer from adversity in childhood and adulthood are harmed by it, they are able to continue with their lives and be successful. Although they suffer, they have important needs and drives that can be fulfilled. They applied the same thinking to communities, stating that though impoverished places carry scars, there are also many success stories.

One committee member, familiar with the concept of risk and protective factors, thought them somewhat in line with what the professors were speaking on, and asked if they still applied in their conceptualization. Mr. Zautra stated that there were two ways of viewing the issue: in the first, risk and protective factors are presented as opposites. In their model, they believe people have both risk and protective factors. In addition, risk and protective factors are used in prevention. Resilience is beyond prevention. Resilience helps us understand how quickly and fully people recover from adversity. Mr. Hall added that they didn't yet know about the interplay between risk and protective factors in communities because communities are so complex.

A committee member asked how a community could know when it is resilient—was there an ultimate goal or was it more of a journey? Mr. Hall answered that it was more of a journey or process, but there are still ways of assessing how resilient a community is, such as looking at levels of civic engagement, social capital, etcetera, and also by how it reacts when adversity hits.

Committee members were then asked to recall to the group occurrences in which they noticed the resilience model being used.

Judy Tapscott commented that the City of Tempe was awarded money to fund a Life Options program, the aim of which was to engage the new population of retirees whose needs, different from that of their predecessors, were not being fulfilled. Joyce Lopez-Powell of the Valley of the Sun United Way spoke about the West Valley Environmental Scan, a project done in cooperation with MAG and which was designed to identify what services are needed to improve quality of life for residents of the rapidly growing area.

Charlene Moran Flaherty of the Department of Economic Services reported that her agency had been working with councils on community initiatives to connect people to

organizations outside of DES, including shelters and faith-based organizations. Carol McCormack from the Mesa United Way shared the story of a neighborhood in Mesa in which a member of the community started an initiative to revitalize and serve her area.

3. Strategic Planning

Ms. St. Peter ask the committee to identifying the three chief priorities of the HSCC and HSTC and establishing objectives for the committees to achieve in the coming year. She outlined the parameters in designating these priorities and listed the responsibilities that were already included in on-going projects and would not need to be addressed. These included the Regional Continuum of Care and the annual HUD application, the Regional Domestic Violence Council, SSBG recommendations and the Human Services Plan.

She then listed the current priorities of the committees, including youth services, aging services and data analysis/sharing. As gathered from previous discussed the following items were listed as options for new priorities: analyses of disparate funding levels, and projected population and need estimates. She asked committee members which, if any, current priorities should be moved to on-going operations. Sandra Reagan suggested Data Analysis/Sharing be moved; the committee concurred and Data Analysis/Sharing was moved to on-going priorities.

Conducting an analysis of disparate federal funding was suggested as an on-going project, as Maricopa County seemed to be receiving inadequate federal funds in comparison to other similar regions. It was brought up that while Boston receives \$9,000 per child for Headstart programs, Phoenix receives only \$6,000 per child.

It was asked what impact the HSCC/HSTC could have on how federal funds are allocated. Dan Lundberg pointed out that MAG has an intergovernmental lobbyist who might play a role; the committees might also help to inform the League of Arizona Cities and Towns of the areas where large discrepancies may exist.

The group also discussed the need to better define the role of each separate committee. This would include the mission, goals and objectives for each.

After several potential focus areas were discussed, Ms. St. Peters asked everyone to select their top three highest priorities. The group wrote their choices down and turned in their papers to MAG staff. The following three items were determined to have the highest priority over the next year.

The three priorities the committee established for the year starting May 2005 and ending May 2006 were as follows:

- 1.) Define the mission or role of the HSCC/HSTC joint committee
- 2.) Perform analysis of federal funding to expose disparate funding

3.) Improve aging services, including elderly mobility

The committee was asked to set detailed, defined objectives to work toward in the next year. The objectives need to be specific, achievable and measurable. The objectives established for the 2005-2006 were as follows:

1.) Define Mission/Role

- a. Appoint a joint HSCC/HSTC subcommittee to develop recommendations regarding the vision or mission of the committees and to adopt these recommendations
- b. Develop separate roles for both committees at the July meeting based on the adopted mission

2.) Analysis of Disparate Funding

- a. Identify federal funds at state/local level for key sources and target groups by September 30, 2005.
- b. Aggregate data and compare to other cities and states by December 30, 2005.
- c. Develop position paper to influence federal appropriation process by January 30, 2005.

3.) Aging Services

- a. Network with grant makers, Governor's office and RPTA
- b. Support MAG research and survey on elderly mobility
- c. Communicate services to community

Ms. St. Peter thanked the committee and informed them that the objectives would be discussed in more detail in the next HSCC and HSTC meetings. She asked the committee to fill out the survey included in their packet and also noted the meeting calendar with the dates of the meetings of the two committees for the next year were included.

4. Subcommittee Updates

Aging

Sandra Reagan reported on the progress of the Aging Services working group. Since January, the group had met three times, in that time they have been evaluating research already done on aging. She imparted that, after appraising the information they had learned, they had decided to first gather public input in order to inform the prioritization process and to help provide data for the Human Services Plan.

Priorities were the following:

- a.) Offering their services to the Governor's Office to help plan for the Arizona delegation that will go to the White House Conference on Aging in October, assuming a planning group has not already been formed.

- b.) Holding focus groups with older adults, possibly age specific between boomers and older, in order to directly determine what their needs and issues are before moving ahead with project ideas.
- c.) Investigating more models on how to engage older adults and not just serve them.
- d.) Explore ways to shift attitudes through advocacy, education, engagement and role modeling.

The group will meet again in May after the HSTC meeting to discuss specific recommendations that may be brought to the full committee in June. MAG staff will provide an update on the status of planning for Arizona's delegation to the White House Conference.

Data Collection

Marge Leyvas of the Data Collection working group provided an update. She first informed them that, recognizing there already exists a rich supply of data and therefore a limited need to collect new information, the group was thinking of changing their name to the Data Analysis Subcommittee or Data Sharing Subcommittee and focusing on analyzing or sharing the existing data to inform human service planning.

She then recounted to the committees that the MAG Geographic Information Systems Division had been training the subcommittee to use census data and the interactive mapping website. Future trainings may include presentations on local data sources and how to access and utilize them.

Youth Policy Advisory Committee

Councilmember Marie Lopez-Rogers informed the committee that the first meeting of the new YPAC group was Wednesday, April 6. She said it was attended by 18 people, including two students. The group discussed challenges that address our young people and agreed it would be essential to have youth participating in the committee. The steps they have decided to take thus far are as follows:

- a.) To conduct a survey, or bring together existing information, on what is needed in Maricopa County in the area of youth development. This may also include an assessment of what services/programs already exist.
- b.) To engage youth and their families in a meaningful way.
- c.) To identify any existing gaps in resources.
- d.) To make policy recommendations based on the first three steps.

She noted that YPAC will be meeting on the fourth Tuesdays at 4:00pm at MAG and invited others to attend.

Regional Domestic Violence Council

Teresa Franquiz, MAG, reported on the Regional Domestic Violence Council. She stated that the Council was just beginning its sixth year and its members felt like this was good time to gather new community input, reassess its priorities and make sure it was still looking at the most pressing issues. She added that in an effort to do such, they would be partnering with the Morrison Institute in a phone survey to assess the public's opinion on domestic violence and to assess the level of awareness of what services are available. She let them know the survey would be performed by Earl De Berge at the Behavior Research Center as part of a larger quarterly survey called MetroTRACK. This was expected to take place in early May.

Ms. Franquiz stated that there would be a Domestic Violence Council Chair meeting on April 19th to formulate a draft of the survey questions that will be asked. The Morrison Institute and the Behavior Research Center would then modify the questions in order to ensure maximum statistical reliability. She also stated that, in addition to the phone survey, there would probably be follow-up performed with anonymous voice messaging and email, as well as focus groups in some Valley shelters.

Regional Continuum of Care Committee on Homelessness

Brandee Mead of MAG introduced herself and reported to the committees on the Regional Plan Update. She first gave a brief history of The Regional Plan to End Homelessness, noting it was created in 2002 and was based on the work of more than 150 individuals over a period of six months. She informed the committees of the Plan's purpose: to raise awareness and offer direction to end homelessness, stating that in the time since its creation, the plan has become a national model and a guiding light for the Continuum of Care.

Ms. Mead informed the committees that, in October of 2004, a group of nearly 40 stakeholders gathered to assess the progress that has been made on the plan, to discuss their goals, the barriers that exist, and collaboration strategies to move forward with the plan. The outcome of the meetings resulted in the Regional Plan Update, the purpose of which is to educate, provide a benchmark for accomplishments and a focus for what remains to be done.

Four goals of the Regional Plan Update:

- 1) Increasing funding
- 2) Preventing homelessness
- 3) Removing barriers to accessing services
- 4) Improving data collection and outcomes.

Examples of progress the Continuum of Care has made:

- Since 1999, HUD McKinney-Vento funds have increased from just over \$7M to

- over \$19M in 2005, with new programs added every year.
- The HMIS implementation is ahead of schedule, making data about homeless people more accessible and reliable.
 - The Evaluation Project has already earned national attention. Implementation will be happening soon and the region will begin analyzing the best practices and needs of homeless programs.

She state that 77% of the goals proposed in 2002 were achieved or engaged, and informed them that the following areas were recommended for action over the next two years:

- Integrate economic development into the plan
- Re-evaluate the goals that have not yet been established for current relevance and measurable action steps
- Engage the community through education and by providing opportunities for partnerships
- Increase prevention activities, as this was the goal with the least action taken but is among the most important activities needed to end homelessness

Ms. Mead then noted that the Regional Plan Update was currently going through the approval process and asked for questions.

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:18p.m.